

ORIGINAL

Before The
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

RECEIVED

MAR 16 2006

Federal Communications Commission
Office of Secretary

FLORIDA CABLE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION,
INC., COX COMMUNICATIONS GULF
COAST, L.L.C., *et. al.*

Complainants,

v.

GULF POWER COMPANY,

Respondent.

E.B. Docket No. 04-381

To: Office of the Secretary

Attn: The Honorable Richard L. Sippel
Chief Administrative Law Judge

**COMPLAINANTS' OPPOSITION TO GULF POWER COMPANY'S
MOTION TO COMPEL REGARDING EXPERT WITNESSES**

The Florida Cable Telecommunications Association, Inc., Cox Communications Gulf Coast, L.L.C., Comcast Cablevision of Panama City, Inc., Mediacom Southeast, L.L.C., and Bright House Networks, LLC ("Complainants"), hereby oppose "Gulf Power Company's Motion to Compel Production of Documents at the Depositions of Complainants' Expert Witnesses ("Motion"). Gulf Power's Motion exceeds the terms of the Presiding Judge's prior rulings and is inconsistent with Gulf Power's own failure and refusal to provide similar information.

In this matter, the Presiding Judge has issued specific orders that govern the parameters of expert discovery. In particular, in the *Scheduling Order*, FCC 05M-60 (Dec. 16, 2005), Judge Sippel provided that "expert summaries and curriculum vitae [were] to be filed and exchanged." This was clarified in an *Erratum* released on February 14, 2006. In the Presiding Judge's *Discovery Order*, FCC 05M-38 (Aug. 5, 2005), the Judge also clarified that the "summaries"

W. of Copies rec'd 0 + 6
List A B C D E

were to be considered “summaries of testimony” and that, in addition to the “summaries,” “the parties shall be required to identify all documents seen by testifying experts in connection with formulating testimonial opinions that are subject to cross examination.” Thus, with respect to expert discovery, the parties were required to produce three things to each other: (1) summaries of testimony; (2) curriculum vitae; and (3) an identification of documents seen by experts “in connection with formulating testimonial opinions that are subject to cross examination.”

Complainants have produced all three: the summaries and the curriculum vitae of Patricia Kravtin and Michael Harrelson on March 3, 2005, and the required identification of all documents relied upon by Ms. Kravtin and Mr. Harrelson in formulating the “summaries” of their testimony on March 10, 2005 (an electronic courtesy copy of which was provided to the Presiding Judge) – all before their scheduled depositions on March 15th and 16th. Copies of documents on the list that were not readily available to Gulf Power’s counsel have been supplied.

Gulf’s attempt, at the last minute, to serve a “discovery request” in its March 9th Notices of Deposition for Complainants’ expert witnesses and to import the requirements of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, including rule 26(a)(2), pertaining to expert “reports” in Federal Court into this administrative proceeding has no basis in Commission rule. Apparently, Gulf wishes to obtain not just copies of documents relied upon by Complainants’ experts but any communications between Complainants’ counsel and its experts.¹ Gulf Power concedes that the Commission “lacks a formal rule governing [the] issue.” Motion to Compel, 3. Gulf argues instead that the Commission generally follows the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure. While this may be true as a general proposition, it is also true that the Presiding Judge has “ordered otherwise” in this case, *cf.* F.R.Civ. P. 26(a)(4), providing instead for sufficient advance filing of

¹ Counsel for Gulf Power indicated that this aspect is now the “focus” of its Motion. See E-Mail message from Eric Langley to Shiela Parker, dated March 16, 2006 (sent at 7:22 a.m.).

expert summaries, the identification of documents used in formulating opinions, and the opportunity prior to the filing of expert testimony to depose expert witnesses.

Gulf's motion to compel is also inconsistent with Gulf's own failure to comply with the very rule that it relies upon and its refusal to provide materials that its expert has apparently relied upon. For example, Gulf Power's own expert witness filing on March 3, 2005, for Roger A. Spain, shows that Gulf itself has not complied with F. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2). Most notably, Mr. Spain's summary fails to even identify all the documents that he has relied upon in formulating his opinions. Instead, it states that he has "reviewed documents including, but not limited to, Bates labeled documents 2437 through 2474, the deposition of Terry Davis, 47 U.S.C. Section 224, and the Alabama Power Company v. FCC 11th Circuit Opinion." Roger Spain Summary, 1 (Attachment A). What documents did he review that were "included" in his review but not specified? Unlike Complainants, Gulf Power has not provided a complete list of documents relied upon by its expert. As Gulf Power has not indicated that its "focus" includes these documents, it is still important for Mr. Spain to provide a complete list of documents not just some plus a vague reference to others.

Furthermore, F.R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2) cannot apply here, where expert summaries were filed simultaneously and each side's experts have yet to complete their testimony. In contrast, Rule 26(a)(2) requires a "report" with "a complete statement of all opinions to be expressed and the basis and reason therefore; the data or other information considered by the witness in forming the opinions; any exhibits to be used as a summary of or support for the opinions; the qualifications of the witness, including a list of all publications authored by the witness within the preceding ten years; the compensation to be paid for the study and testimony; and a listing of any other cases in which the witness has testified as an expert at trial or by deposition within the preceding

four years.” Gulf’s March 3rd filing for Mr. Spain has not even come close to providing all this information. It is a summary that expressly reserves the right to modify its content. Moreover, there is no list of publications, no information about compensation, and no listing of other cases in which Mr. Spain has testified and the list of documents reviewed is, by its own terms, only partial. Again, as Gulf Power has now shifted its “focus” to only communications between counsel and the experts, it is still important for Mr. Spain to provide a complete listing.

Gulf has also refused to provide Counsel for Complainants notes used by a key witness, Ms. Terry Davis, whose work and calculations Gulf’s expert, Mr. Spain, says he relied upon. Mr. Spain’s summary says that he reviewed Ms. Davis’ deposition and approximately 40 pages of exhibits (and possibly more) attached to Ms. Davis’ deposition. Roger Spain Summary, 1 (Attachment A). Yet, at Ms. Davis’s deposition, Gulf Power’s counsel sought to have Ms. Davis be able to refer to “a notebook” and to testify from that notebook without permitting Complainants’ counsel to view the notebook. See Transcript of Deposition of Terry Davis, pp. 25-28 (Attachment B). Gulf Power’s double standard here – demanding that any communications between counsel and Complainants’ experts be produced, including drafts of the “summaries,” while refusing to disclose all the documents Mr. Spain relied upon and produce notes used by the only witness that Mr. Spain refers to, shows that its Motion to Compel is no more than an exercise in gamesmanship.

For all of the foregoing reasons, Complainants respectfully request that the Presiding Judge deny Gulf Power’s Motion to Compel Production of Documents at the Depositions of Complainants’ Expert Witnesses.

Respectfully submitted,



John D. Seiver
Geoffrey C. Cook
Rita Tewari

COLE, RAYWID & BRAVERMAN, LLP
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 659-9750

Counsel for

**FLORIDA CABLE TELECOMMUNICATIONS
ASSOCIATION, COX COMMUNICATIONS
GULF COAST, L.L.C., COMCAST
CABLEVISION OF PANAMA CITY, INC.,
MEDIACOM SOUTHEAST, L.L.C., and BRIGHT
HOUSE NETWORKS, L.L.C.**

Michael A. Gross
Vice President,
Regulatory Affairs and
Regulatory Counsel
**FLORIDA CABLE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASS'N, INC.**
246 East Sixth Ave., Suite 100
Tallahassee, FL 32303
(850) 681-1990

March 16, 2006

ATTACHMENT A

Summary Report of Roger A. Spain, CPA, CVA

INTRODUCTION

I have been engaged by the law firm of Balch and Bingham, L.L.P. to evaluate various methodologies for valuing Gulf Power Company's pole space. In performing my analysis, I reviewed documents including, but not limited to, Bates labeled documents Gulf Power 2437 through 2474, the deposition of Terry Davis, 47 U.S.C. Section 224, and the *Alabama Power Company v FCC* 11th Circuit Opinion.

QUALIFICATIONS

I am a manager with Aldridge, Borden & Company, P.C. in Montgomery, Alabama. We are a CPA firm providing a wide range of specialized services, including management consulting, strategic planning, litigation consulting, business valuation, mergers and acquisitions consulting, tax planning, compliance, auditing, and information technology consulting.

My own areas of expertise include accounting and business consulting in several industries, including the electric distribution industry. As an auditor, I have performed numerous audits of electric distribution utilities, and several other types of other utilities. I have also performed numerous consulting engagements in the utilities arena, including cost of service studies, rate analysis and design engagements, property plant and equipment analyses, and feasibility studies. Companies for whom I have performed these services have been electric providers, telephone companies, cable television and satellite dish companies, natural gas companies and retail propane companies. I also have significant experience in auditing and tax related work in the general business environment. I am a Certified Public Accountant licensed to practice in Alabama and Mississippi. I also hold the Certified Valuation Analyst designation through the National Association of Certified Valuation Analysts. The attachment to this summary contains additional biographical information.

STANDARD OF VALUE

I have been instructed by counsel to perform my analysis assuming the access and attachment to Gulf Power Company's poles by cable television companies results in a taking, and that as a result Gulf Power Company is entitled to fair market value.

NATURE OF DISTRIBUTION PLANT

This case involves the valuation of a unique asset: Gulf Power Company's pole space. Because the pole space resides on poles which are an integrated component of a large single asset (a complete electric distribution system), its value is enhanced beyond its stand alone value. As a functioning piece of the distribution system the value of pole space is not simply the allocated cost of a pole plus the cost to install it; rather the value of the space is its value in use as part of a larger distribution system.

BUSINESS ENVIRONMENT

Gulf Power Company operates within the historically regulated electric industry. Such regulation has historically protected the territory of electric distribution systems, as it was deemed to be in the public's best interest to avoid the duplication of services. By limiting the duplication of services the public expects to benefit by not having to pay for more than one distribution system.

One result of this regulated environment is that there is usually only one provider of electricity in a location, and, therefore, often only one potential provider of pole space available for attachment. This creates a limited available market for those wishing to lease pole space.

At the same time, cable television companies participate in an industry with few other cable television providers in a given marketplace. The result is a historically limited number of potential cable television pole attachers.

By having a limited available market for purchasers of pole access, a limited number of potential cable television pole attachers and considering the history of pole attachment regulation, historically transactions between Gulf Power Company and cable television companies have not been conducted in a typical open market setting.

NATURE OF THE ATTACHMENT

What is at issue is the value of the elevated corridor available to carry communications lines and not simply the value of the pole. It is not practical to think of this corridor without considering the existence and related value of the pole on which the corridor resides. Therefore, the value of the pole is an important component of the value of the corridor, but it is not the only

component or consideration. As mentioned previously, these poles are a piece of a larger electric distribution system asset. In addition to the cost of the pole and the related installation costs, there are other costs and factors affecting the value of the actual pole including the value in use element, right of way procurement, engineering, and administration.

In addition to factors affecting the value of the pole itself, there are two important elements in the value of the elevated communication corridor. The first additional element of value is the obligation to maintain electric distribution plant at or above a level expected by the public and required by regulatory bodies. This obligation to maintain poles at certain levels renders all poles as functionally new. In relation to the value of the elevated communication corridor, it is not practical to separate the obligation to maintain a pole from the value of the corridor that resides on that same pole.

Elevated corridor value is also affected by a second element. That is the fact that the risk of loss on the pole remains with the pole owner. This is especially relevant given that the pole space is expected to be available to the attacher into perpetuity. In the event of distribution plant obsolescence, destruction, or failure, the obligation and expense to replace and rebuild a pole rest with the pole owner, and not the pole attacher. Therefore, the realistic expectation that the corridor will always be available is another component of the value of the corridor.

COMPARISON TO OTHER TANGIBLE PROPERTY

I have submitted that what is being valued is a corridor of space on a series of utility poles, and that there are different elements of that corridor including the pole itself, an obligation to maintain that pole, and a retention of the risk of loss by the pole owner. I will now focus discussion on the value of the pole.

First, I have stated that I have assumed the appropriate standard of value is fair market value. The definition of fair market value in continued use is,

“the estimated amount, expressed in terms of money, that may reasonably be expected for a property in an exchange between a willing buyer and a willing seller, with equity to both, neither under any compulsion to buy or sell, and both fully aware of all relevant facts...”¹

¹ Valuing Machinery and Equipment: The Fundamentals of Appraising Machinery and Technical Assets, Second Edition, Machinery and Technical Specialties Committee of the American Society of Appraisers, Page 3.

Within traditional equipment valuation and appraisal methodologies, there are three approaches to the determination of value. They are the cost, sales comparison, and income approaches. For reasons discussed below, I will focus on the cost approach to determining fair market value in this situation.

According to the American Society of Appraisers, under the cost approach,

“The appraiser starts with the current replacement cost new of the property being appraised and then deducts for the loss in value caused by physical deterioration, functional obsolescence, and economic obsolescence.”²

As noted in the passage above, the replacement cost of an asset is an accepted starting point for determining the fair market value of equipment. In the event of a contemplated change in ownership of an asset, depreciation³ becomes an important component in the determination of fair market value, and must be deducted from the replacement cost. This is necessary in order to give credit to a purchaser/lessee for the portion of an asset ‘used up’ by the seller/lessor.

This same cost approach to determining fair market value is also an accepted and often used methodology in determining appropriate lease rates for equipment. There are two very critical similarities between traditional fair market determination for potential sales and lease transactions; 1) the risk of loss customarily transfers to the buyer/lessee, or user of the equipment, and 2) the useful life of the equipment is finite.

Pole attachment arrangements and typical equipment sales and leases are similar in some respects. Most notably, both are based on the use of tangible property or equipment. However, there are also several important differences between a typical equipment sale or lease, and pole attachment arrangements. These include:

- 1) Term of use – under a normal sale or lease arrangement, the useful life or term of use of an asset is limited, whereas under a pole attachment arrangement the term of attachment is not foreseeably limited.

² Ibid, Page 5.

³ Further, the American Society of Appraisers defines depreciation for valuation purposes as, “the estimated loss in value of an asset, compared with a new asset; appraisal depreciation measures value inferiority that is caused by a combination of physical deterioration, functional obsolescence, and economic (or external) obsolescence.”

2) Functionality – during the lease term or useful life of the asset, the asset's functionality will decrease as time passes or the asset is 'used up,' whereas under a pole attachment arrangement there is no diminution in functionality of the underlying asset.

3) Risk of loss – In a traditional lease or sale, the risk of loss and cost to replace are borne by the purchaser or lessee, whereas under a pole attachment arrangement the risk of loss and cost of replacement are held by the pole owner.

FAIR MARKET VALUE ISSUES

In assessing the fair market value of a piece of an electric distribution system's total plant, one will encounter difficulties in applying both the sales comparison approach, or market method, and the income approach.

Regarding the sales comparison approach it is important to distinguish between applying this approach to valuing electric poles and valuing the elevated communication corridor. Based on my preliminary review of Gulf Power Company's unregulated attachment rates, it could be appropriate to use the sales comparison approach, at least for purposes of evaluating corroborative information.

The primary difficulty in applying the sales comparison approach to the valuation of the actual poles, is that there is often a lack of comparable transactions involving distribution plant sales. In the event that a valuation expert did find transactions involving the purchase/sale of electric distribution plant, the individual facts and circumstances surrounding each transaction would often significantly limit the applicability of those transactions to other situations.

In trying to apply the income approach to value a piece of an electric distribution system, one would encounter difficulties in trying to determine what portion of a power company's total income or cash flows are attributable to that piece of the electric plant in question. Because of these difficulties the income approach generally becomes impractical as an approach to valuing an electric company's poles and the space on those poles.

The cost approach is generally the most appropriate method for a valuation of an in use asset.⁴ Additionally, the American Society of Appraisers notes that "the cost approach is frequently used for unique types of assets for which there is no quantifiable income stream and no reliable market or sales data."⁵

Another issue regarding the value of the poles to which communications companies attach relates to the notion of cherry-picking. As a practical matter, attachers will typically attach to the most desirable, highly valued poles within a power company's territory. Where fair market value is the standard of value, this renders any method using average costs for determining the appropriate pole attachment rate artificially low. By using system averages, whether based on historical or current replacement costs, in calculating a pole attachment rate no allowance is made for the more highly valued poles to which cable television companies are attaching.

Simply stated, because pole attachers are likely to cherry pick the most attractive sections of Gulf Power's electric distribution system, overall plant valuation averages may place Gulf Power in a position of under-recovery under a fair market value standard of value

ALABAMA POWER COMPANY v. FCC OPINION

I have reviewed the *Alabama Power Company v FCC* Opinion and the "test" set forth in that opinion. In my opinion as a valuation analyst, the "another buyer waiting in the wings" portion of that test in a fair market value scenario must be a reference to the hypothetical buyer. Any interpretation requiring an actual buyer or actual buyers would be inconsistent with the established principles of the fair market value standard.

The *Alabama Power Company v FCC* test alternatively requires Gulf Power Company to show a "higher valued use with its own operations." In my opinion as a valuation analyst, this requirement is at odds with valuation principles and business practices, insofar as it disregards higher valued uses outside of the owning entity's operations. One likely reason for an entity to sell an asset is that there are others who have a higher-valued use for the asset.

⁴ John L. Gadd, Chair responsibility, The Opinion of the College on Defining Value in Use, Published in *Valuation*, vol. 32, no. 1, June 1989.

⁵ *Valuing Machinery and Equipment: The Fundamentals of Appraising Machinery and Technical Assets*, Second Edition, Machinery and Technical Specialties Committee of the American Society of Appraisers, Page 316.

HISTORICAL COSTS ARE NOT REFLECTIVE OF FAIR MARKET VALUE

Historical costs are not intended to and generally do not represent fair market value. The fair market value of a company is rarely reflected in its historically based accounting records or financial statements. If the historically based accounting records or financial statements did agree with the fair market value of a company, or its assets, this would be merely coincidental.

GULF POWER COMPANY'S CALCULATION

I have reviewed Gulf Power Company's pole attachment fee calculation. In these calculations Gulf Power Company uses a fully embedded replacement cost as a basis for the computed rate. In a fair market value scenario, the replacement cost methodology is acceptable and consistent with valuation principles, as noted above. The general methodology for calculating the carrying charge appears to be consistent with the terms of the code of federal regulations. The allocation methodology in the Gulf Power Company calculation involves allocating usable and unusable space to attachers. The justification for this is that without the unusable portion of the pole there would be no elevated communications corridor. Therefore, all users of the pole should bear the cost of the unusable space on the pole.

CONCLUSION

A replacement cost methodology is the most appropriate estimation of fair market value for Gulf Power Company's pole space.

There are other factors that are of a qualitative nature and are very real that have not been quantified. These include the issue raised regarding the probability that attachers are cherry picking the poles to which they are attaching. As a result, the treatment of all poles as average would very likely understate the value of the poles to which a cable television company attaches. Additionally an asset that is in use often has a value greater than replacement value. Because it is difficult to quantify these factors, I have not attempted to do so. However, these factors could have an upward influence on the value of pole space, making Gulf Power Company's calculations conservative.

I reserve the right to modify my opinions as additional information becomes available to me.

ROGER A. SPAIN, C.P.A., C.V.A.

Roger Spain is a manager with Aldridge, Borden & Company, P.C., in Montgomery, Alabama. He is a 1990 graduate of Auburn University where he received a Bachelor of Science degree in Accounting. He has spent over twelve years in public accounting.

Roger's area of expertise is in accounting and business consulting. He also has significant experience in the audit and tax services areas. Roger is a Certified Public Accountant licensed to practice in Alabama and Mississippi. He also holds the Certified Valuation Analyst designation offered by the National Association of Certified Valuation Analysts. Having successfully completed levels 1 and 2, Mr. Spain is a level 3 candidate in the Chartered Financial Analyst (CFA) program.

Education/Certification

- Bachelor of Science in Accounting, Auburn University, 1990
- Certified Public Accountant, Alabama, 1992
- Certified Public Accountant, Mississippi, 1999
- Certified Valuation Analyst, 2003

Areas of Practice

- Management Advisory and Consulting Services
- Traditional Accounting and Tax Services

Services Provided

- Business Valuation
- Accounting and Auditing
- Tax Consulting and Preparation

Professional Memberships

- American Institute of Certified Public Accountants
- Alabama Society of Certified Public Accountants
- National Association of Certified Valuation Analysts

Teaching

- Numerous Courses on Utility Accounting throughout the United States
- Auburn University, Professor for a Day Program

ATTACHMENT B

TERRY DAVIS

BEFORE THE
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554

TELECOMMUNICATIONS ASSOCIATION,
INC., COX COMMUNICATIONS GULF
COAST, L.L.C., ET. AL,

Complainants,

vs. CASE NO.: 04-381

GULF POWER COMPANY

Respondent.

-----/

DEPOSITION OF TERRY DAVIS

Taken by Pamela Dee Smith, a Court Reporter and Notary
Public, State of Florida at Large, in the offices of
Beggs & Lane, LLP, 501 Commendencia Street,
Pensacola, Florida, on Friday, November 18, 2005,
commencing at approximately 8:30 a.m.

ANCHOR COURT REPORTING

229 South Baylen Street	6856 Caroline Street
Pensacola, Florida 32502	Milton, Florida
(850)432-2511	(850)626-6207
FAX (850)432-2302	FAX (850)626-4589

AnchorReporters@aol.com

TERRY DAVIS

A P P E A R A N C E S

FOR THE COMPLAINANTS:

JOHN D. SEIVER, ESQUIRE
Cole, Raywid & Braverman, LLP
1919 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Suite 200
Washington, D.C. 20006

FOR THE RESPONDENT:

ERIC B. LANGLEY, ESQUIRE
and NATHAN CHAPMAN, ESQUIRE
Balch & Bingham, LLP
1710 Sixth Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203-2015

COURT REPORTER:

PAMELA DEE SMITH
ANCHOR COURT REPORTING
229 South Baylen Street
Pensacola, Florida 32502
(850)432-2511
1-800-563-6409
FAX: (850)432-2302
AnchorReporters@aol.com

AnchorReporters@aol.com

TERRY DAVIS

INDEX OF TRANSCRIPT

WITNESS:

TERRY DAVIS

Direct Examination by Mr. Seiver.....05

Certificate of Oath.....182

Reporter's Deposition Certificate.....183

Errata Sheet.....184

INDEX OF COMPLAINANTS' EXHIBITS

37 Notice of Deposition of Terry Davis.....05

38 Replacement Cost For Pole Attachments

Based on 2003 Data.....29

39 Replacement Cost For Pole Attachments

Based on 2001 Data.....29

40 Replacement Cost For Pole Attachments

Based on 2004 Data.....30

41 Gulf Power Companies' Roll-Forward-Ledger-
Distribution-Plant-Units.....92

42 Gulf Power's Itemization of Evidence
Provided That Is Referred To In The
Description Of Evidence.....147

43 Calculation Of Maximum Cable Pole
Attachment Rate, Gulf Power Year End
2001 FERC Data.....164

44 Various FERC 1 Forms.....181

AnchorReporters@aol.com

TERRY DAVIS

STIPULATION

It is stipulated and agreed by Counsel for
the parties that the deposition is taken for
the purpose of discovery and/or evidence;
that all objections save as to the form of
the question are reserved to the time of
trial; and that the reading and signing of
the deposition are not waived, together with
notice of the original hereof.

* * * * *

AnchorReporters@aol.com

1 should be included in the calculation.
 2 Q. And what specifically of the
 3 replacement costs did you discuss?
 4 A. I would like to refer to one of the
 5 calculations.
 6 MR. LANGLEY: John, Terry has with
 7 her a notebook which has, essentially, the
 8 documents that have been given to you, plus
 9 some arrows and notes that she has to help
 10 her navigate seamlessly through this. I
 11 thought that it would probably speed things
 12 up, but if she were allowed to refer to
 13 that during the deposition; is that
 14 acceptable to you?
 15 MR. SEIVER: As long as I can have a
 16 copy.
 17 MR. LANGLEY: Of her notebook?
 18 MR. SEIVER: Well, if she's going to
 19 be testifying from it, I think I need to
 20 see it.
 21 MR. LANGLEY: Well, the problem with
 22 that is that I think her notebook -- and I
 23 haven't actually reviewed all of her own
 24 handwritten notes in the notebook, but some
 25 of it may have nothing to do with the

1 calculations and have something do with
 2 another issue that I have talked to her
 3 about.
 4 The deposition will be a lot easier
 5 on everyone, you included, if she is able
 6 to use her copies of the calculations.
 7 MR. SEIVER: I'm all for easing it
 8 up, it's just that I don't think I can do a
 9 deposition with a witness testifying from
 10 notes that I can't see.
 11 MR. LANGLEY: Well, she is testifying
 12 from documents that you have, but I believe
 13 what she has done in this notebook is drawn
 14 cross-references so that she can know
 15 exactly where she needs to flip and direct
 16 you, for example, to a specific part of the
 17 investment -- pole investment breakdown.
 18 MR. SEIVER: Well, I think I am
 19 entitled to it.
 20 MR. LANGLEY: Well, that may be an
 21 issue that we have to resolve with the
 22 judge.
 23 MR. SEIVER: I guess I don't
 24 understand what the problem is if she is
 25 going to be testifying from it and it is

1 going to say -- you know, ease things up
 2 and speed things up, I don't understand the
 3 problem with me seeing it so I can see the
 4 lines that are drawn and understand what
 5 she's referring to. Otherwise I am not
 6 going to understand it.
 7 MR. LANGLEY: Well, she can tell you.
 8 MR. SEIVER: Well, if she can tell me
 9 from the exhibit, that's fine. But if she
 10 is telling me from another document, I
 11 don't think that there is any theory that
 12 would keep it from being produced to me.
 13 MR. LANGLEY: Well, I disagree with
 14 that. But if what you are saying is that
 15 if for her to be able to refer to her
 16 notes, you're going to have to have a copy
 17 of it, then she just won't refer to the
 18 notes and whatever consequences that means
 19 in terms of accuracy, fluidity or speed,
 20 we'll just have to deal with.
 21 MR. SEIVER: Well, you are putting me
 22 in a spot, because, you know, we're trying
 23 to get this done and I want to get this
 24 done timely. I don't want to drag this out
 25 and basically you are putting me between a

1 rock and a hard place saying either she
 2 gets to use it and you can't see it or if
 3 she doesn't, then you might not get
 4 everything. So, I am really a little
 5 disappointed that if a witness is going to
 6 use something to help them testify, I don't
 7 think any witness on any witness stand
 8 could ever use notes to testify without
 9 them being produced to opposing counsel.
 10 MR. LANGLEY: I think if she was
 11 testifying at the FCC, then anything she
 12 had up there with her would be something
 13 that you could see.
 14 MR. SEIVER: But this is pretty close
 15 to testifying at the FCC.
 16 MR. LANGLEY: All right. Terry, you
 17 are not to refer to your notes. John, take
 18 your deposition.
 19 Q (By Mr. Seiver) My question had been
 20 about costs, when you had discussions of costs
 21 earlier with Mike Dunn you said you talked about
 22 replacement cost and components and I want to know
 23 what specific costs you were talking about with
 24 Mr. Dunn.
 25 A. May I look at the exhibit?

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a copy of the foregoing, *Complainants' Opposition to Gulf Power's Motion to Compel Regarding Expert Witnesses*, has been served upon the following by electronic mail and U.S. Mail on this the 16th day of March, 2006:

J. Russell Campbell
Eric B. Langley
Jennifer M. Buettner
BALCH & BINGHAM LLP
1710 Sixth Avenue North
Birmingham, Alabama 35203-2015

Lisa Griffin
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W. – Room 4-C343
Washington, D.C. 20554

Ralph A. Peterson
BEGGS & LANE, LLP
501 Commendancia Street
Pensacola, Florida 32591

Sheila Parker
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W.
Washington, D.C. 20554

Rhonda Lien
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W. – Room 4-C266
Washington, D.C. 20554

Marlene H. Dortch, Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
Office of the Secretary
445 12th Street, SW
Washington, D.C. 20554

James Shook
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W. – Room 4-A460
Washington, D.C. 20554

Kris Monteith
Enforcement Bureau
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street, S.W. – Room 7-C485
Washington, D.C. 20554


